



# Reinvest - Reuse - Renew

A Blueprint for the Development of a Comprehensive Preservation Implementation Program

## **Reinvest - Reuse - Renew**

Published 1992 by the City of Columbus, Ohio

The project team thanks Steve McClary, Daniel Thomas, and Diane Cole of the City of Columbus; the staff of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office; and all the citizens of Columbus who took time to be interviewed, to attend meetings, and to read and comment on drafts of this document.

### **Project Team**

**Jeffrey Darbee**, historic preservation consultant with Benjamin D. Rickey & Co. of Columbus, has worked in historic preservation since 1974, first with the Ohio Historical Society, and since 1980 in private consulting.

**Scot Dewhirst**, partner in the Columbus law firm Artz, Dewhirst & Farlow, served in the Columbus City Attorney's Office as the Development Department's attorney; he is a member of the German Village Commission.

**Gretchen Klimoski**, of GLK & Associates in Columbus, has over 20 years' experience in historic preservation, both with the Ohio Historical Society and in her consulting work; she specializes in assisting non-profit groups in budgeting, organization and strategic planning.

**Nancy Recchie**, historic preservation consultant with Benjamin D. Rickey & Co., has worked in historic architecture and preservation since 1975. She is former director of the Mid-Ohio Regional Preservation Office and has served on the Columbus Historic Resources Commission.

**Judith Williams**, historic preservation consultant, has worked full-time in preservation for nearly ten years, prior to that working in the Office of Local Government Services of the Ohio Department of Development. She is a member of the German Village Commission.

This publication has been made possible in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of the Interior's National Park Service, administered by the Ohio Historic Preservation Office of the Ohio Historical Society. The mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute or imply endorsement by the Ohio Historical Society. Discrimination in Federally-assisted programs is prohibited. For information contact the Office of Equal Opportunity, Washington, D.C. 20240.

## Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. METHODOLOGY	4
III. DEFINING PRESERVATION	6
IV. PRESERVATION IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	7
V. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
City Policy	
Regulations	
Neighborhoods	
Downtown	
Tools and Incentives	
Education and Public Awareness	
VI. IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES	28
VII. DESIGNATION PRIORITIES	34
VIII. APPENDIX	36
Sample Questionnaire	
List of Those Interviewed	
Architectural Review Commissions in Columbus	
Area Commissions in Columbus	

## **I. Introduction**

The City of Columbus is at a critical stage in its growth and development: it has undertaken its first comprehensive planning effort since 1908. Over an 18-month period, city staff, various consultants, and community representatives were involved in an intensive planning effort studying a wide range of problems and issues related to Columbus' future. The Comprehensive Plan contains recommendations that are fairly general in nature, since they are meant to provide overall direction to the City in the development of specific policies and programs.

One of the Plan's major-goals is preservation of the city's cultural and historic resources. In response to a proposal by the City's Historic Preservation Office, the Ohio Historic Preservation Office awarded matching funds for development of a strategy to implement the preservation recommendations in the Plan. The City hired Benjamin D. Rickey & Co., a Columbus preservation consulting firm, to undertake the project during the spring and summer

The project's goal was to provide an action-oriented framework for a comprehensive City preservation program, and this report presents the project's results. The recommendations provided here will integrate preservation with, rather than separate it from, other planning and development activities such as zoning, regulations, code enforcement, housing, and economic development. Although all of the recommendations are consistent with the direction provided by the Comprehensive Plan, the preservation strategy developed through this project can also stand alone as the strategic plan for the City's preservation efforts.

Chapters II, III, and IV of Reinvest- Reuse - Renew outline the methodology for this project and give background information on the preservation recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan. Chapters V, VI, and VII discuss key issues and concerns raised during the extensive public input phase of the project, and the specific recommendations that resulted. Chapter VIII contains the appendix, with additional information pertaining to the project. This report is organized to facilitate an understanding of preservation issues and opportunities in Columbus for those who have had little involvement previously, as well as for community activists who may be very familiar with the subject.

The Comprehensive Plan provides Columbus citizens with an opportunity to look closely at the city and to develop a vision for what Columbus should be in the future. Similarly, this report provides those interested in preservation with the opportunity to examine where preservation has been successful and effective and where and why it has been less successful. An important part of this project was conducting interviews with business people, neighborhood activists, preservation proponents, political leaders, and City staff. Those interviewed felt that Columbus has the potential to be one of the country's most interesting and livable urban areas, but achieving this will take much hard work on the part of community activists and the strong support, encouragement and cooperation of the City administration.

## II. Methodology

This project had the goal of developing realistic and effective preservation strategies for Columbus. There were three key components to the project team's work:

1. extensive public input;
2. research to identify effective programs currently in use in Columbus and
3. analysis of issues and development of recommendations.

### Public Input Phase

Solicitation of public input was the most critical aspect of this project. Just as the Comprehensive Planning Process looked at where Columbus has been, where it is now, and where it is heading, this project needed to assess the current state of preservation in Columbus. To determine a sound direction for the City's preservation program in the future, we felt strongly that a broad-based effort to learn the public's attitude was essential. Three techniques were utilized to afford maximum public participation in the process -- individual and group interviews, questionnaires, and public workshops.

#### Interviews

Both one-on-one and small group interviews were conducted with a diverse cross-section of the community. Elected public officials, downtown business leaders, neighborhood and community activists, developers, business people and city staff were interviewed. Interview questions were designed to solicit responses about perceptions of what preservation is, and what the opportunities and barriers for successful preservation programs are in Columbus. A list of the individuals interviewed is included in the Appendix.

#### Survey

A one-page questionnaire was developed to reach a larger number of individuals than was possible through interviews and public workshops. The questionnaire was designed to solicit opinions about how successful preservation efforts have been in the past; what role preservation should play in developing Columbus' downtown and neighborhoods; what the opportunities for preservation are; and what barriers are impeding preservation efforts. The questionnaire was distributed through the Department of Human Services newsletter (The Communicator) and mailed to over 700 community leaders. It was also distributed at meetings of the historic district commissions and at events sponsored by the Columbus Landmarks Foundation. The results of returned questionnaires were compiled and analyzed; while the questionnaire was designed for short answers, a number of individuals took the opportunity to write longer and very detailed responses, which were most helpful in our work. A sample questionnaire and a summary of the results are included in the Appendix.

#### Workshops

There were two public workshops. The first was designed to identify key preservation issues and establish priorities for the issues to be addressed. The second workshop, conducted after the project team had developed an outline of recommendations, reviewed and refined those recommendations. Several excellent ideas were generated at this second workshop, and they have been incorporated into this report.

#### Research and Analysis Phase

The project team used interview notes, questionnaire results, and the results of the first workshop to develop a list of key preservation concerns/issues. These issues, which are discussed in Chapter V, provided the framework for conducting research on programs, techniques and tools that have been successful both here and elsewhere. Each team member then developed recommendations for discussion at a group meeting. The experience of the project team members, combined with results of the research phase, resulted in a lengthy and detailed discussion of opportunities for preservation in Columbus. The recommendations contained in this report respond to those opportunities.

The City of Columbus Planning Division and the Ohio Historic Preservation Office reviewed the draft of the report and provided valuable insight and suggestions during the project.

#### How to Use This Report

*Reinvest - Reuse - Renew* is intended to be a working document. While it gives many concrete suggestions about approaches, programs and activities that should further the goals of preservation in Columbus, it should also be used as a springboard for further discussion and for expansion or modification of ideas. The project team feels that *Reinvest - Reuse - Renew* provides a sound foundation for a comprehensive preservation program for Columbus.

### III. Defining Preservation

Though few would disagree that historically and architecturally significant buildings are among a city's most valuable assets, a broader, more inclusive definition of preservation is needed if the City is to achieve the goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and in this report.

One of the most important findings of this study was that there is no consensus in Columbus about what is meant by "historic preservation," the term generally used to refer to the retention and reuse of older buildings, structures, and districts. Our broad-based research, and interviews with neighborhood residents and advocates, public employees and officials, area commission members, preservation advocates, and others, revealed varying interpretations of the term. To some, historic preservation means the saving of key buildings or areas which possess outstanding historical or architectural significance. To others, historic preservation has a broader meaning, encompassing the saving of neighborhoods, older housing stock, and older commercial areas simply because they exist, and because they represent a long-term investment of money and energy and can be made efficient, safe and useful.

Disagreement seemed to center on the "historic" part of the term rather than on "preservation." What is "historic" to one person may not be so to another. The project team feels that another term such as "Community preservation" is more comprehensive, encompassing neighborhood, economic, social, and cultural concerns while still accommodating the concern for the physical/architectural make-up of the city. The team, therefore, uses the term "preservation" in its broadest sense, which is reflected in this report's title, Reinvest-Reuse - Renew. One goal of this report is to promote the concept that older buildings do not have to be important historically or be architectural landmarks to be valuable. Even relatively undistinguished older buildings add architectural diversity, texture, scale, and detail to the streetscape and allow a city to be distinctive. Further, preserving the physical character, housing stock, and economic viability of areas also helps maintain important social and family networks.

A second goal of this report is to present the benefits of a sound preservation policy. Implementation of preservation goals in Columbus should be viewed as a means to:

- ♦ Preserve the cultural and architectural character of the city;
- ♦ Improve the quality of its neighborhoods;
- ♦ Encourage appropriate economic development and growth which is not done at the expense of losing more of the city's urban fabric;
- ♦ Enhance the city's physical appearance and conserve its unique assets.

Finally, it is the project team's hope that this report will help the city's leadership and regulatory bodies to recognize the value which many citizens place on preserving the scale, style and character of the city's past. To be successful, Columbus' preservation program will need to develop strong policies, sound programs, and a range of activities which promote design quality, neighborhood conservation, and protection of "character of place."

#### IV. Preservation in the Comprehensive Plan

Cities are constantly changing, and a myriad of decisions made daily by public officials, private interests, and community activists can have a dramatic impact on the physical development and appearance of a city. Columbus has undertaken a comprehensive planning process in an effort to provide a framework for decision-making that will enhance the quality of the built environment, while fostering orderly, manageable and cost-effective development and redevelopment. As a result, the Comprehensive Plan addresses city-wide issues such as growth management, infrastructure improvements, and transportation policies, as well as issues relating specifically to neighborhoods, downtown, and new development districts.

A number of the recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan, in areas such as land use, infrastructure, community facilities, neighborhood residential and commercial development, downtown development, and transportation can be viewed as having a positive impact on preservation. In summarizing the Comprehensive Plan recommendations relating to preservation, we recognize that the decision to preserve and invest in an older property is based on a number of factors. For instance, the zoning code can encourage or discourage preservation efforts, as can the building code. Investment, or lack of it, in the infrastructure in an area can influence private investment in that area as well.

Outlined below are some key policy recommendations contained in the Comprehensive Plan that are supportive of preservation efforts.

1. Land Use - Land use recommendations contained in the Comprehensive Plan encourage investment in and redevelopment of central city areas as a balance to the suburban and fringe area development that has occurred in recent years. Rather than further promoting unplanned urban sprawl, the Plan addresses the need to ensure sensitive development of new areas, while fostering investment in existing areas of the city already served by infrastructure. The need for compatible infill development is also identified. Investment in older areas and compatible infill are at the heart of a strong preservation program. Columbus' strong neighborhoods, ringing a vital urban core, provide many opportunities for reinvestment and reuse.
2. Infrastructure - The Comprehensive Plan recommends that the City make improvements to existing infrastructure a top priority in the budgeting process for capital improvements. Since the infrastructure in many of the city's most historic areas is quite old, an increased investment in rehabilitation and maintenance of older infrastructure will enhance the chances of private investment occurring in these areas and will foster preservation of existing resources.
3. Neighborhoods - The Comprehensive Plan recommends requiring development standards for all neighborhoods through revisions to the City's Zoning Code. These standards would strive to maintain the character of existing neighborhoods. It further recommends that incompatible zoning that detracts from neighborhood character be discouraged and that action be taken to arrest housing deterioration. The Plan also addresses rehabilitation policies for Columbus neighborhoods; each neighborhood falls into one of three categories of change -- growth, stable, or revitalization. Overall, the Plan's neighborhood recommendations serve to encourage preservation activities because they recognize that neighborhood diversity, neighborhood character, compatible land use, building appearance, and pedestrian orientation contribute to visually interesting, livable neighborhoods.
4. Downtown - One goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to ensure that downtown remains the city's primary commercial, cultural, and entertainment center, as well as a major retail and residential center. The Plan recommends the use of downtown development guidelines to encourage design excellence. It also recommends preservation of downtown's significant historic resources by employing more stringent review procedures and by making economic incentives available when necessary. Both of these recommendations are supportive of preservation goals.
5. Historic Preservation - A separate section of the Plan deals specifically with preservation issues. The recommendations are divided into categories -- general policies, and policies dealing with neighborhood preservation, historic districts, and individual historic structures. The overall goal of these policies is to encourage ongoing identification and protection of historic resources through the following activities: continuing nomination and designation of individual buildings and historic districts; encouraging



rehabilitation rather than demolition for nuisance abatement cases; improving coordination and communication between the City's historic preservation and other areas of city government; establishing district review commissions and architectural review standards; permitting only infill and revitalization efforts that are responsive to the historic context of historic districts; and providing design handbooks and seminars to encourage sensitive rehabilitation.

These various recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan can be viewed as broadly supportive of the goals of a sound preservation program. In fact, the Comprehensive Plan provides a good basis for development of more effective and better organized preservation policies than in the past.

## V. Issues and Recommendations

Our research and interviews revealed several issues related to preservation in Columbus which came up again and again. We met and talked with numerous people who had little or no contact with each other, yet they tended to cite similar or identical issues when assessing the state of preservation in the city. These people readily cited examples, facts and statistics and told us of perceptions and myths that affected preservation, all of which helped to define the issues and suggested ways in which the issues would have to be addressed.

It became clear that there was a broad consensus among neighborhood residents and advocates, design review commission members, historic building owners, business people, design professionals, and many others about issues that need to be addressed if preservation goals in Columbus are to be achieved in any meaningful degree.

While there were differing views, the issues described below are generally representative of the opinions of those who participated in the project. Issues are divided into six areas:

- ♦ City Policy
- ♦ Regulations
- ♦ Neighborhoods
- ♦ Downtown
- ♦ Incentives and Tools
- ♦ Education and Public Awareness

Each issue is followed by a brief discussion designed to clarify the issue statement. This discussion is followed by our recommendations for addressing that issue. Each recommendation was designed to be realistic, achievable and effective. Most recommendations can be implemented without substantial increased spending, but they do require more effective use of interns and existing staff positions while at the same time fully utilizing community resources, such as the vast expertise and commitment represented by members of the city's commissions, neighborhood, and non-profit organizations. Where recommendations involve expenditures not currently in the city budget, the programs could be phased in over a period of time as the money becomes available. Some of the recommended programs are also potential candidates for corporate or foundation support. Our recommendations are intended to build on the many strengths of preservation in Columbus while addressing the most significant current problems and impediments to a sound preservation program.

## **ISSUE AREA: CITY POLICY**

### **ISSUE 1:**

**The City of Columbus needs to develop a clear preservation policy and take a leadership role in building consensus about preservation priorities.**

While "Preservation" is identified as an important goal of the Comprehensive Plan, a number of respondents in our interviews stated that they were concerned because the City itself lacked a clear and well-developed preservation policy for City-owned or -controlled historic properties. It seems inconsistent for the Comprehensive Plan to emphasize the importance of preservation for private interests while there is no stated commitment from the City that it intends to make preservation a priority for its own properties. This need for a City preservation policy is especially critical because of the large number of important public buildings involved and because the City should set an appropriate example for private interests to follow. To be truly effective, the leadership must come from the elected officials and should be articulated to appropriate city departments.

There was also the belief that inadequate coordination among City departments has led to situations where the City appeared to work at cross-purposes with itself. The issue of the Northern Hotel in the North Market Historic District, where in 1991 two City agencies were seeking demolition and preservation at the same time, was identified on several occasions as a good example of inadequate policy and coordination. City departments are seen as organized in a way that does not give responsibility for addressing preservation concerns to any single department (for example, housing matters and the German, Italian, and Victorian Village commissions are handled by the Human Services Department, while the North Market and Historic Resources commissions, planning, regulations, and economic development are handled by the Development Department). This led to less effective use of staff time and expertise than would be possible under a different organizational structure. The City is now in the process of a reorganization that should address some of these problems. Housing, area and historic district commission responsibilities are being transferred to the Development Department.

There was a perception that the community at large has been unable to determine what should be preserved, that there has been no consensus about priorities, and there was a feeling that various segments of the community do not talk to each other about this problem. These perceptions were cited as support for the notion that stronger leadership from the City itself is needed.

### **RECOMMENDATION 1:**

**Develop a clear, well-articulated City policy regarding preservation, and an organizational structure to implement this policy.**

#### **\* Develop and Adopt a Strong Preservation Policy**

The City of Columbus has an extremely important role to play in promoting preservation and enhancing preservation opportunities. This is both legitimate and necessary, since preservation involves such significant urban issues as community pride and quality of life, maintenance and expansion of the tax base, reversal of decline in older areas, maintenance of urban infrastructure, and creation and retention of jobs and businesses. A strong preservation policy providing guidance for both public and private actions and investments will go a long way toward helping to accomplish these goals.

#### **\* Protect City-Owned and -Controlled Historic Buildings**

The Mayor and City Council need to develop and adopt a stated policy on the treatment of historic structures owned or controlled by the City, including but not limited to City Hall, the Central Police Station, Central High School, the Ohio Penitentiary, fire stations, bridges, streets and roadways, recreational facilities, archaeological resources, and other kinds of city property. This would aid all city departments in knowing what is expected of them when they must deal with such structures. An important first step should be a thorough inventory and assessment of all such City property, followed by development of a process for decision-making regarding the future of such properties.

**\* Organize Departmentally Effectiveness and Efficiency**

While some changes are already underway as this report is being developed, it is worth repeating that the City should establish a single department which includes the following functions: Housing; Regulations (zoning and building codes); Area and Historic District Commissions; Urban Design; Planning; and Economic Development. These have a direct impact upon preservation issues, as well as in many other areas, and there is strong logic to having all of these related (and often inter-related) functions together. This should also help avoid the problem of various entities' working at cross-purposes. The City's preservation officer must play a major role in coordinating both commission activities and other City functions affecting preservation. Preservation should be a more proactive force within city government. Reorganization and better coordination increase the chances for proactive activity to occur.

**\*Establish a "Preservation SWAT Team"**

The City should consider establishing a "Preservation SWAT Team" that could be called upon when historic structures are threatened with damage or demolition. Composed of the City's Historic Preservation Officer, City economic development and regulations staff, and representatives of entities such as the Columbus Landmarks Foundation, the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, the Historic Resources Commission, and one or more of the neighborhood commissions or organizations, this team's role would be to examine an emergency situation quickly and make recommendations to the City and the property owner on how a threatened property might be preserved. In some cases outside assistance might be needed in specialized areas such as architecture, engineering, real estate, or marketing. A small fund should be set aside to pay for professional services when needed.

**ISSUE 2:**

**City preservation legislation creating the Historic Resources Commission is too weak to be effective.**

Weakness of the City's historic preservation legislation was identified as one of the reasons preservation efforts have not been as successful as they could be. For example, the Historic Resources Commission is able to delay demolition of properties listed in the Columbus Register for only a 105-day period. Respondents have said that a longer time period would act as a disincentive for demolition while also allowing more time to find alternatives to demolition. There was a feeling that lack of "teeth" in the Commission's decision-making made it difficult to protect Columbus Register properties.

**RECOMMENDATION 2A:**

**Amend existing preservation legislation to make the Historic Resources Commission more effective.**

**\*Develop Amendments to Preservation Legislation**

The Historic Resources Commission needs enhanced powers to delay or prohibit demolition of registered properties. Penalties for violation need to be strengthened to provide a stronger deterrent. Several designated properties are currently endangered, and the existing legislation can do very little to protect them. The loss of significant properties, especially when located within historic districts, can have an adverse impact on neighboring properties and the district as a whole. If properties are worthy of designation by City Council, then they are truly worthy of protection. Several years ago, there was widespread concern that stronger legislation might be onerous for property owners in "hardship" situations. However, that issue has since been addressed by the creation of the Board of Commission Appeals, which is empowered to review decisions made by City-created commissions.

The Historic Resources Commission is responsible for a number of widely-scattered historic districts, which can make it difficult to coordinate activities and communicate with neighborhood organizations as well as to monitor compliance with the law. Amendments to the legislation should specify that two or three of the "at-large" members of the Historic Resources Commission be owners of designated

properties (either individually or within historic districts). This should help to increase awareness of the Commission and its work among property owners and neighborhood residents.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 2B:**

**Develop a priority list for the Historic Resources Commission to designate buildings and areas, especially those at risk.**

##### **\*Develop a Priority Designation List**

The Historic Preservation Officer, working with a Designation Committee composed of Historic Resources Commission members, should establish a priority designation list. Priorities can be based on past Certified Local Government-funded preservation planning projects (see the reports Historic District Evaluation for the City of Columbus, published 1989, and Historic Property Evaluation for the City of Columbus, published 1990). This list should be monitored regularly to assess any change in the status of key buildings and areas. Designation of individual properties should have as much priority as designation of historic districts. Recommended designation criteria are described in Chapter VII of this report. The Commission should work vigorously to make new designations.

#### **ISSUE 3:**

**City Council, the Development Commission, and the Board of Zoning Appeals need to give greater consideration to recommendations formulated by the various commissions.**

Columbus has established an effective system of area and design review commissions. However, there are strong feelings that the City should give much greater consideration to recommendations made by both design review and area commissions. Many people feel frustrated by the ease with which carefully thought out recommendations could be countered by political means. Additionally, respondents feel that the regulatory bodies need to have a better understanding of the role of the commissions and the problems and issues they face. Commissions also have a responsibility to educate themselves about the issues they are considering and to make sound recommendations that can be readily conveyed to the decision-making bodies.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 3:**

**Develop a more effective system for presenting and advocating commission recommendations to City Council, the Development Commission, and the Board of Zoning Appeals.**

##### **\*Facilitate Contact Between Commissions and Political Bodies**

The City should address this issue in a way that 1) facilitates contact between the commissions, Council, and BZA during consideration of issues, so that commission recommendations are not formulated in a vacuum; and 2) removes, to the greatest extent possible, the influence of political pressures from the recommendation process. Of course, many issues on which the commissions make recommendations and on which Council or BZA must then act are likely to be controversial and will involve political pressures. However, a better process for review which involves consultation and consensus-building between the commissions, Council, and BZA can do much to achieve more balanced decision-making. There should be a brief but formalized reporting form identifying the issue and summarizing the reasons for a commission's recommendations, which should be sent with the application to the reviewing body. Ideally, a commission member should be present at meetings where a decision is being made to answer questions and facilitate the review by the appropriate review body. It might be necessary to adjust the timing of the various commission meetings in relation to meetings by decision-making bodies to ensure that recommendations can be made in a timely manner without causing undue delay for applicants.

**\*Position Commission Recommendations as Sound Advice**

The City should strongly encourage that a commission member attend meetings to present the commission's position on an issue when one is under consideration by Council, the Development Commission, or the BZA. If a commission member cannot be present, City staff should make a presentation of the written report (described above) of the commission's position. City Council, the Development Commission, and the BZA should adopt policies that commission recommendations will be dismissed only for very good reasons; these bodies should communicate to the commissions a sense of trust that the commissions are knowledgeable about their areas and are capable of sound decision-making. In turn, commissions must earn this trust by being knowledgeable about the issues they are considering; by making sound recommendations; and by carefully documenting the reasons for their recommendations.

## **ISSUE AREA: REGULATIONS**

### **ISSUE 4:**

**Regulations officials (those dealing with the building and zoning codes) need to take a more active role in facilitating preservation activities.**

There was much discussion, during our interviews and research, about the role of regulations, enforcement of existing regulations and the need to modify or create new regulations to encourage and support private preservation efforts underway in the city.

There was a strong feeling that greater efforts at comprehensive code enforcement need to be made by the City, so that neglected properties could be caught when problems can still be remedied rather than later when deterioration is so great that demolition occurs. Further, there should be a more constructive and creative way of dealing with nuisance abatement than simply through demolition of the nuisance property. Respondents saw a need generally for more creative use of existing rules and regulations to deal with problems such as non-conforming commercial uses in residential neighborhoods. It appears that most problems can be dealt with through enforcement of existing regulations.

Respondents cited numerous examples of what they saw as zoning issues that were impediments to revitalization efforts, especially in central city neighborhoods. The high concentration of group homes and other institutions in certain neighborhoods; the undermining of neighborhood revitalization efforts by current zoning categories; and an inappropriate balance of commercial, institutional, and residential uses in some neighborhoods were identified as evidence of the importance of this issue. Failure to develop consistent criteria for the issuance of zoning variances and ignoring the requirements that a hardship must exist to justify a variance were seen as creating confusing standards that send mixed signals to applicants. Cited also was the problem of zoning that was instituted long after the development of a neighborhood, resulting in requirements for such matters as building height and setback that are inconsistent with the existing character of the neighborhood.

### **RECOMMENDATION 4A:**

**Make a greater effort to use more aggressive code enforcement to solve problems.**

#### **\*Provide Systematic and Consistent Code Enforcement**

Enforcement of building and zoning codes needs to be systematic and consistent on a citywide basis. Property owners should be able to know that, no matter where they own property, they will face the same obligations derive the same benefits from the City's code enforcement efforts. Since some property owners know how to manipulate the law so that they do not have to respond in a timely manner, follow-up is important once orders have been issued.

#### **\*Support Architectural Renew Commissions**

The City needs to ensure that architectural review commission approvals for exterior changes to properties are enforced. If non-approved projects are found, it is essential that a "stop work" order is issued and that the owner is required to apply for a "Certificate of Appropriateness." If unapproved work is completed then the owner should be taken to court and fined. Unapproved work within historic districts should not be tolerated.

#### **\*Make Greater Use of Maintenance Ordinance**

The Historic Resources Commission and historic district commissions, with support from the City Attorney's office, should not hesitate to make use of the existing "Failure to Maintain" ordinance (C.C. 3116.22), to help address the problem of property deterioration through neglect. Some owners who know that they would not be able to get a "Certificate of Appropriateness" for demolition within a

historic district allow their property to deteriorate to the point where demolition is the only option. The purpose of the "Failure to Maintain" ordinance is to recognize that unapproved demolition can still occur through the lack of maintenance, and that it is unacceptable to fail to maintain properties.

#### **\*Monitor Pivotal Buildings**

There should be stricter monitoring of pivotal older buildings, whether or not they are designated as historic, so that situations of "demolition by neglect" can be caught early and dealt with. Neighborhood organizations and area and district commissions could provide valuable assistance to the city staff by monitoring in their areas and promptly reporting any suspected violations or change of status. There should be a combined code inspector/code enforcement officer assigned to these buildings. This combined position is intended to reduce confusion and misunderstanding that often results from the current system, in which two different officials become involved in code enforcement.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4B:**

**Tailor code enforcement efforts in older neighborhoods to facilitate the preservation of sound buildings.**

#### **\*Create a Preservation Code Enforcement Specialist Position**

There should be a "preservation code enforcement" specialist with specific training in older building technology and preservation/rehabilitation techniques that could encourage the preservation of sound older buildings. The recent establishment of the new Environmental Court will assist in consistent enforcement of city ordinances.

#### **\*Tailor Enforcement Paperwork for Historic Buildings**

In historic districts and for individually designated historic properties, where demolition is strongly discouraged, there should be specific regulation paperwork that takes account of a property's special historic status. Instead of reading "repair or demolish," for example, orders should instruct an owner to "repair and maintain after consultation with the appropriate regulatory commission." A check-off box listing the commissions could direct property owners to the appropriate commission.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4C:**

Focus nuisance abatement efforts in designated districts and older neighborhoods on building stabilization and conservation rather than on demolition.

#### **\*Make Stabilization the Focus of Nuisance Abatement**

Nuisance abatement through demolition provides a short-term answer to an immediate problem, but the resulting constant erosion of both residential and commercial areas creates a new problem of disinvestment and neighborhood decline. Many areas have nearly lost their "critical mass" of buildings necessary to keep them economically viable.

Boarding up, stabilization, and conservation of currently unused buildings should be the focus of nuisance abatement efforts, but it must be accompanied by ongoing efforts to find new owners and new uses for these properties.

One of the greatest problems with nuisance properties are owners who are unable or unwilling to undertake necessary repairs. This issue is addressed in the Ohio Revised Code (Section 719.012) which provides that a municipal corporation may appropriate property that has been declared a public nuisance, for the purpose of rehabilitation and resale. This legislation allows great flexibility and creativity in dealing with nuisance properties.



A report issued by the City's Historic Preservation Officer in November, 1990 summarized findings of a Nuisance Abatement Task Force which was established to examine this very issue. It contains worthwhile information and recommendations. Included in the report is information about a program in Dayton, Ohio which encourages the rehabilitation of vacant property by providing small grants or "bounties" (usually not more than the cost of demolition that the City is now assuming) to non-profit Neighborhood Development Corporations to purchase and rehabilitate vacant residential properties.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4D:**

**Amend the city's zoning code to recognize central city development patterns and to enhance and not conflict with neighborhood character and revitalization efforts.**

##### **\*Adopt Neighborhood-Sensitive Zoning Standards**

The City should formulate and implement neighborhood-sensitive zoning standards that take account of existing central city patterns of neighborhood character in matters such as setback, building height, lot coverage, use, density, and parking. The City should work with representatives of central city neighborhoods in developing these zoning standards.

##### **\*Rezone where Appropriate**

The City should undertake neighborhood or area rezoning where it is appropriate as a means of encouraging desired reinvestment. The recommended rezoning of the Grant-Washington Discovery District in the Discovery District Area Plan, for example, is intended to encourage residential and appropriate commercial uses instead of parking lots and industrial uses allowed under existing zoning. This recommendation resulted from a careful study of the area's character, uses, and potential. The examination of current and potentially more appropriate zoning should be part of any area or neighborhood plan.

#### **ISSUE 5:**

**The City needs to improve the operation and administration of existing design review commissions.**

The City has established several historic district design review commissions (see Appendix for information about both design review and area commissions). People generally feel that the commissions have been a great benefit, successfully maintaining the character of historic districts and stabilizing and improving property values, thus encouraging investment.

However, some people have expressed the feeling that new development seems not to be welcome in historic districts; and that in some cases the application process is time-consuming and adds "red tape" and increases project costs. The need for greater administrative support and training for commission members was cited several times.

There was concern about the length of time between favorable commission action on a proposal and actual issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness. It is not uncommon, according to some respondents, for applicants in some historic districts to wait several weeks between approval by a commission and issuance of a certificate by the City.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 5:**

**Make improvements to the design review process through commission training, staffing improvements, and procedural improvements.**

##### **\*Expedite Certificate Issuance**

Expedited issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness should be pursued. A possible solution may be use of portable computers which can be taken to commission meetings to allow immediate certificate issuance upon commission approval of routine cases.

Every effort should be made to issue certificates for the more complicated cases within one week. Another option would be to have a commission stamp for design/plan approval that can be applied, upon commission approval, to the submitted application and plans, if no changes are required. The stamped drawings can then be submitted to the Building

Regulations Division for issuance of a building permit. If changes are required by the commission, then a "Certificate of Appropriateness" with the specific changes required would be issued.

#### **\*Improve Staffing**

Refer to Recommendation 1 regarding re-organization of City agencies dealing with preservation, where all commissions would be housed in one department and would benefit from the training and expertise of the City's Historic Preservation Officer. In addition, the commissions' staff should be supervised by the Historic Preservation Officer; the commissions' secretary should have training and experience in preservation; and the City should hire a preservation architect as previously approved in City legislation.

A good deal of the frustration that is sometimes felt by applicants going before the commissions can be eliminated if applications can be dealt with more quickly and if they can receive more thorough staff level review to catch "red flags" early. The German Village Commission, for example, has had a part-time assistant for some time, privately funded through proceeds from Oktoberfest, who assists applicants in various ways; the process has worked well and could be a model for other commissions.

#### **\*Undertake Design Renew Training for Commissioners**

Design review commission members should receive regular training in restoration, rehabilitation, and preservation technology; design review procedures and requirements; and dealing effectively with the public. This could be undertaken through a cooperative effort with agencies such as the Columbus Landmarks Foundation or the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, where a number of knowledgeable people are available. Training would be especially important for new commission members who may not have a thorough knowledge of preservation matters and design review procedures. In addition to receiving training, members of the various commissions should meet regularly to share experiences and learn from one another.

## **ISSUE AREA: NEIGHBORHOODS**

### **ISSUE 6:**

Preservation activities need to accommodate the economic and cultural diversity of Columbus neighborhoods.

There is broad agreement that one of Columbus' greatest assets is its urban neighborhoods. With their substantial and well-preserved housing stock; their variety of housing types; their organized, committed, and effective advocates; and their location close to the downtown area, major employers, and transportation routes, many neighborhoods stand ready to provide safe, attractive, affordable housing for residents of all backgrounds and economic levels.

Respondents cited the feeling, however, that "preserving" neighborhoods may make affordable housing impossible, and that there is an inability to control the rise in property values (and taxes) when a neighborhood sees increased rehabilitation activity. There is a very strong general feeling that keeping housing affordable is a critical element if neighborhoods are to attract residents back to the city, which everyone saw as desirable.

Respondents cited a feeling that there was inadequate neighborhood involvement in preservation issues and that preservation could be a tool to build a sense of community and ownership in the city's neighborhoods.

### **RECOMMENDATION 6:**

**The City should continue to promote neighborhood-based planning so that plans reflect the desires and concerns of neighborhood residents and property owners.**

#### **\*Develop Neighborhood Plans**

The City and neighborhoods have successfully prepared neighborhood-based plans in areas such as Franklinton, the Hilltop, and the University area, and these efforts should continue. Successful neighborhood-based planning combines the City's technical planning skills with the residents' instinctive knowledge and understanding of their neighborhood's needs.

Neighborhood cultural history should be an important part of any neighborhood plans, and activities recommended in the plans should recognize and enhance that history. Especially in areas that do not have outstanding architecture, an emphasis on the neighborhood's cultural history can provide a focus for revitalization efforts.

### **ISSUE 7:**

**There is a need for design review and control in neighborhoods not designated as historic, but not necessarily based on current models of the historic district commissions.**

Respondents felt that some level of design review was important in order to strengthen and reinforce neighborhood identity, to get neighborhoods more directly involved in preservation issues, and to help ensure that infill construction and rehabilitation were compatible and sensitive to the character of the neighborhoods.

It was clear, however, that respondents were not necessarily seeking the detailed architectural review of projects that occurs in the existing historic districts. There was a strong feeling that some level of design review was desirable even in areas that would not qualify as "historic districts" under current criteria, but it was not necessary to have a "historic district" level of review.

Many respondents mentioned a desire for appropriate infill development to fill gaps in neighborhood streetscapes caused by random demolition over the years.

## **RECOMMENDATION 7:**

**Develop "conservation zoning" for neighborhoods, areas, and districts wishing to have some level of design review short of full historic district commission review.**

### **\*Undertake Conservation Zoning**

The concept of general design standards (to deal with issues such as setback, form, density, etc.) is employed in the Hilltop and University area plans as a way to encourage compatible development in these areas without detailed design review requirements. A program called "Conservation Zoning" was developed by the city of Nashville, Tennessee and could provide guidance for a similar program in Columbus. See the Appendix for information on the Nashville program.

The Nashville program makes a distinction between Historic Zoning Districts and Conservation Zoning Districts. Review of proposed projects in the Historic districts is much more thorough and rigorous than in the Conservation districts. Reviews in the Conservation districts are confined to additions, new construction, and demolition, and concern such matters as building massing, form, height, setback, and overall design elements such as porches, garages, and outbuildings. Review of ornamentation, paint colors, windows and doors, and other details typically is not undertaken. It is important to note that with conservation zoning incompatible rehabilitation can occur without any review being required, as the focus is really only on new construction, additions, and demolition. Many neighborhoods, however, indicated that this would be a more appropriate level of review for their neighborhoods and that it would address the issues of greatest concern to them.

Conservation zoning usually is accomplished through overlay zoning; its goal is preservation of the character-defining features of neighborhoods and the encouragement of appropriate. A conservation zoning program, like any program of design review, needs strong support by means of information brochures, procedure flow charts, and published design guidelines. In Nashville, the required reviews are undertaken by the historic review body. Columbus could assign responsibility to the Historic Resources Commission or, because the City has a network of area commissions, a sub-committee of an area commission might appropriately undertake this review.

### **\*Develop "Infill Prototype" Project**

The best way to demonstrate that appropriately designed infill construction can also be cost-effective is to develop a demonstration project. Columbus already has organizations undertaking new affordable housing construction in older city neighborhoods, although not always using designs that the neighborhood residents and commissions feel are appropriate. The City, neighborhood organizations and commissions, and the agencies that are providing affordable housing should work together to design and develop a demonstration project that meets the goals of both affordability and quality infill design. At the very least, these organizations should work together to develop some appropriate infill prototype designs that can be used as a model for future development.

## **ISSUE 8:**

**Enforcement of building and zoning codes is seen as critical to supporting private revitalization efforts in neighborhoods.**

Numerous respondents cited the negative effects that can result from inconsistent or weak enforcement of zoning and building codes: deteriorated structures and illegal uses discouraging private investment, leading to disinvestment and physical decline. They saw the City's strong support of private efforts as crucial.

## **RECOMMENDATION 8:**

**Systematically enforce building and zoning codes, with an eye to catching problems before they become nuisances.**

### **\*Develop a Neighborhood "Spotter" Program**

A systematic approach should include neighborhood "spotters" who work with the City to identify and monitor problem properties. This should help encourage a spirit of cooperation between the public and private sectors.

### **\*Implement Neighborhood-Sensitive Zoning**

As noted in some detail in Recommendation 4D, the City should consider techniques such as downzoning or changes in zoning standards to reflect community character, as a means of minimizing the need for enforcement actions and to make an area's zoning more compatible with its actual use, character, and development patterns.

## **ISSUE 9:**

### **There is a need for greater awareness of the neighborhoods as a community asset.**

Respondents felt strongly that the neighborhoods of Columbus do not get enough "press," nor enough "good press." They felt that the variety in housing stock, the affordability of housing, the opportunities for new infill construction, and the increasing stabilization of ever larger residential areas all were significant positive factors of which lenders, real estate agents, and the media should be aware. While this can be considered an "education" issue, it has such an important effect on neighborhood planning and investment that it is addressed in this section.

## **RECOMMENDATION 9A:**

### **Work with neighborhood advocates and organizations to aggressively promote the neighborhoods' benefits to the entire Columbus community.**

#### **\*Promote Benefits of the City's Neighborhoods**

Promotional materials -- slide shows, videos, written and pictorial materials -- should be made available to target audiences such as the Chamber of Commerce and business leaders, real estate professionals, the media, and lenders. Lenders in particular may wish to become involved in such efforts as part of their Community Reinvestment Act compliance efforts.

#### **\*Develop and Maintain a "Model House" as a Training Laboratory**

Rehabilitation and maintenance of a "model house" as a teaching tool for neighborhoods should be considered by the City. Its purpose would be to showcase cost-effective rehabilitation methods and techniques, ways to preserve architectural character during rehabilitation, and design ideas to make existing housing more functional and efficient. A model house could be the focus of neighborhood events; a "clinic" for training sessions for homeowners, contractors, and builders; and the site of workshops for real estate professionals. A neighborhood model house could play a role similar to that of houses currently included in events such as the Parade of Homes, the Decorators' Show House, or the "Smart House" built by the American Electric Power Company. Suitable candidates for the City's model house might be the Caretaker's Cottage in Franklin Park, or the Eddie Rickenbacker House on Livingston Avenue.

Labor and materials for rehabilitation of a model house could probably be obtained through donation or at a discount or wholesale price; corporate sponsorship might also be possible. The City should work with neighborhoods and other organizations (such as the Columbus Landmarks Foundation and the Downtown Neighborhoods Association) to develop educational programs and other activities to promote use of the house. Over time, the model house could be sold and a new one developed in another neighborhood.

## **RECOMMENDATION9B:**

**Document through photographs the changes that have occurred in neighborhoods and develop a process to monitor change over time.**

### **\*Record Visual Changes in Neighborhoods**

Most change that occurs in a neighborhood is slow and incremental, not sudden and dramatic, and over time even long-term residents have a hard time remembering when and how changes occurred. An ongoing effort -- primarily by neighborhood residents, advocates, or organizations -- should be undertaken to make a photographic record of each neighborhood today and of the various changes that occur in the future. Such a visual record could be invaluable in future planning efforts or when the issue of appropriate infill design or new construction comes up.

Such a record could be particularly useful for historic districts subject to design review, as a means of tracking changes while at the same time ensuring that those changes are made in accordance with approved plans.

**ISSUE AREA:  
DOWNTOWN**

**ISSUE 10:**

There has been and continues to be a loss of the historic "fabric" of the downtown that robs Columbus of much of its historic and architectural character.

Respondents were very concerned about what they saw as an unacceptably high loss of important downtown buildings and other elements of the urban fabric such as streetscapes, through streets and alleys. The problem is not just the loss of older buildings, but also the presence of large amounts of vacant land, and lack of a means of influencing or controlling the as, character of new or infill construction.

Lack of design or preservation standards for the downtown area came up as a concern for a number of people. There was a strong feeling that decision-making should not be occurring in the absence of a well-thought-out downtown plan to guide the physical character of new development.

**RECOMMENDATION 10A:**

**Undertake new and continue existing activities oriented toward influencing the character and quality of downtown development.**

***\*Adopt Goals for a Better Built Environment***

The publication Goals for a Better Built Environment, published in 1988 by the Columbus Landmarks Foundation, provides an organized, rational approach to evaluating downtown development. This publication should be formally adopted by the City as its downtown development guidelines and should be reprinted and distributed widely. Compliance with recommended approaches in this publication, which are flexible and allow great creativity, should be mandated by the City for all new downtown development. Refer to the Appendix to see Downtown Columbus, Inc.'s Urban Design Strategies, particularly Item 1, regarding this.

***\*Continue to Develop Area Plans***

The City and Downtown Columbus, Inc. should continue, for other parts of the downtown, the successful area planning efforts that have gone forward in the Brewery District, Pen West, and the Grant-Washington Discovery District. Such planning should look closely at the rezoning of areas where activities such as housing or neighborhood-scale commercial development are seen as desirable. Preservation planning should be incorporated in each area plan if the area contains older buildings.

**RECOMMENDATION 10B:**

**Encourage the retention and reuse of existing buildings.**

***\*Identify and Designate Key Buildings and Areas***

Key individual buildings and areas or districts should be identified and designated by the City so that design review by the Historic Resources Commission can take place. See Recommendation 2B.

***\*Document Downtown Buildings***

Building on the success of the recent "Broad & High" exhibit at the Ohio Historical Society, there should be a concerted effort to gather current and historical documentation on all remaining downtown buildings dating from before 1950. Organizations such as the Columbus Historical Society, the Columbus Landmarks Foundation, and the Downtown Neighborhoods Association might

become involved in such an effort. Refer to Downtown Columbus, Inc. ' s Urban Design Strategies #9 and #29 in the Appendix.



## **ISSUE AREA: TOOLS and INCENTIVES**

### **ISSUE 11:**

**There is a need for incentives to stimulate preservation activities.**

Respondents cited what they saw as "disincentives," both real and perceived, that impeded preservation investment: a feeling that the federal Historic Tax Credit for Rehabilitation is not worth the trouble of applying; that "preservation work" is more expensive than ordinary rehabilitation; and that there are few local or state incentives designed to encourage investment in older areas.

Respondents felt that incentives need to be created and promoted for both commercial investors and for current or prospective homeowners. They saw encouragement of home ownership as very Important, and felt that packaging and promotion of specific preservation opportunities was needed to bring investors back into older areas.

### **RECOMMENDATION 11:**

**Explore a variety of ideas and opportunities for economic incentives to encourage investment in the city's older neighborhoods and districts.**

Some incentives are tax-related, some require finding new funding from public and private sources, and some are actions the City can undertake using currently available resources.

#### **\*Maintain Infrastructure**

The City should make a strong commitment to maintenance and improvement of infrastructure in the older areas of Columbus, particularly the neighborhoods, as a means of encouraging private investment. This should be accompanied by targeted investment in amenities (trees, lighting, recreational facilities, parks) for areas where private investment is occurring or is expected or desired. Consistent with recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan, older areas of the city should receive priority for this kind of investment, before extension of infrastructure and amenities to new, undeveloped land.

#### **\*Use the Power of Eminent Domain**

While the City has used the power of eminent domain to promote new development, it could be an effective tool for preserving important older properties. The City should develop a policy of using eminent domain to prevent loss of key buildings and areas. Part of any such policy should be, in each instance, a plan for turning over the condemned property to an entity prepared to preserve it. Such a transfer could include assistance for rehabilitation from a revolving fund established for the purpose. The City should also consider foreclosure of tax-delinquent properties as a means of acquiring key buildings or important land parcels. Using these techniques, the City could establish a land-banking program of vacant parcels to encourage appropriate new development.

#### **\*Establish a Revolving Fund**

In cooperation with local preservation groups and funding sources such as foundations and lenders, a revolving fund should be created to permit acquisition of key buildings when they are threatened with demolition. The fund's goal should be to acquire, stabilize and hold property for the short term while sympathetic buyers are found. Protective covenants to ensure preservation should be attached to the property before it is sold by the City. Sources of funding (including grants, private and corporate donations, and public funds) should be actively sought to establish this long-overdue but important fund.

### **\*Explore and Adopt Tax Incentives**

Tax incentives to encourage private investment should be explored. The federal Historic Tax Credit has been used by some people, but its utility is limited because it is only for income-producing properties listed in the National Register, and it cannot be used at all for purely owner-occupied residential buildings. Incentives are needed for both income-producing (commercial and residential) and owner-occupied properties. Possibilities include partial property tax abatement; partial city income tax abatement; property tax freeze; or a credit against property taxes. Like other abatement and credit programs, these incentives are intended to forgo some current tax revenues in order to encourage investment and strengthening of the tax base, thereby increasing future tax revenues and lessening the need for City efforts such as code enforcement and nuisance abatement. Refer to Downtown Columbus, Inc.'s Strategy #22, in the Appendix, regarding tax relief to encourage downtown investment. Even a few years' tax relief could provide an incentive; tax relief could be tied to existence of a neighborhood plan, thus encouraging areas currently without plans to undertake them.

### **\*Promote Housing and Housing Finance Programs**

The City should actively promote, in cooperation with neighborhood advocates and organizations, existing housing and housing finance programs. At the same time, the City should lobby against program elements that discriminate against existing housing. Financing through the Ohio Housing Finance Agency, for example, currently mandates a lower maximum selling price for existing housing than for new (currently, in Columbus the maximum prices for new houses are \$163,460 in target areas and \$133,740 in non-target areas, while existing home prices cannot exceed \$107,580 in target areas and \$88,020 in non-target areas). Also, housing financed through OHFA must be in "move-in" condition, eliminating houses that are substantial and sound but in need of rehabilitation. The OHFA rules may be liberalized, but the City still should pursue this matter because of the potential benefits to existing urban neighborhoods.

### **\*Package Rehabilitation Opportunities**

The City should take a leadership role in packaging and promoting opportunities for rehabilitation to potential investors and developers, just as it has done with major new development projects in the past. This applies to both commercial and residential properties. Many developers are looking for opportunities to undertake rehabilitation of existing structures, utilizing programs such as the Historic Tax Credit or the Low Income Housing Tax Credit. Other targeted programs may also be appropriate. Sometimes simply bringing an opportunity to the attention of a developer can result in a rehabilitation that would not otherwise go forward.

**ISSUE AREA:  
EDUCATION and PUBLIC AWARENESS**

**ISSUE 12:**

**There is a need for greater public awareness of and support for preservation activities in the community.**

Education about preservation is an ongoing need in any community. As our interviews and research have shown, preservation in Columbus has a broad constituency, even including people who do not consider themselves "preservationists." Knowledge and skill levels among these people vary widely, and the field of preservation is constantly evolving, with new programs and techniques in ongoing development. Even people who work in preservation full-time have trouble keeping up.

Respondents cited, and research revealed, widespread misperceptions and misinformation about preservation; many people saw a narrow definition of "historic preservation" as problematic, tending to create a limited constituency and blunting its effectiveness because of uncertainty over what the term means. Some people cited concerns about possible restriction of property rights as a result of preservation activities such as design review.

There was a strong feeling that there is generally inadequate publicity for successful preservation projects.

Many people felt that there is a lack of general public concern for aesthetics or for saving the heritage of Columbus; and that the community has a general orientation toward promoting suburban growth. Related to this was a feeling that there is a lack of business and corporate support for preservation.

**RECOMMENDATION 12A:**

**PUBLIC EDUCATION**

**The City should develop well-researched materials that document the benefits of preservation activities in Columbus.**

**\*Develop Materials on the Benefits of Historic Preservation**

Promotional materials could be developed in cooperation with local preservation groups, agencies, and funding sources; materials might include publications, brochures, slide shows, and videos, and they should focus on such matters as the amount of investment that has occurred and is occurring in the City's neighborhoods; the amount of investment occurring in commercial districts (such as the Brewery District); and the value and impact of heritage tourism (German Village being an excellent example). Included should be figures and other data showing how preservation investment has stabilized and increased the tax base, the safety, and the livability of many areas of the city without driving out current residents.

**\*Develop Materials on Preservation Techniques**

Educational materials, designed as part of a series accompanying the promotional materials suggested above, should be developed to educate people about preservation techniques, programs, and incentives. Considerable material, much of it in the public domain, is already available and may easily be adapted for use in Columbus.

**\*Provide Information on Cost-Effective Rehabilitation**

The City should consider developing instructional programs and publications about cost-effective rehabilitation techniques that residents can learn easily. Doing appropriate work and avoiding inappropriate work can do much to make neighborhood preservation affordable.

**\*Develop a Preservation Model House**

The City should develop a "model house" (see Recommendation 9A) as an educational facility for the general public where preservation techniques, principles, practices, incentives, and benefits can be highlighted.

**\*Develop a Resource Materials Library**

In addition, the City should develop resource materials for use by City staff as well as the general public. Set up as a non-circulating reference library, these materials could include referral lists for contractors in various trades (the City should consider a program to certify contractors who have completed training in preservation work), and information about technical assistance the City provides building owners.

**RECOMMENDATION 12B:**

**INTERNAL EDUCATION (CITY STAFF)**

**Provide training for City staff in all aspects of preservation.**

City staff members, including those whose primary duties do not include preservation activities, would benefit from an organized training program. Broader knowledge of preservation issues, programs, techniques and how preservation relates to their areas of expertise could make many City staffers' jobs easier and their work more effective.

Training should include Building Regulations staff, housing rehab technicians, area and historic commissions, City Council and Council staff, and City department heads. Training could be set up through the Preservation Officer, possibly with aid and assistance from the Columbus Landmarks Foundation and the Ohio Historic Preservation Office. Such training would probably qualify for funding under the Certified Local Government program.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES

This report contains recommendations comprising a comprehensive and effective preservation program for the City of Columbus. It is probably not feasible to implement all of these recommendations in the short term; however, the goal should be to implement as many recommendations as possible within a five-year period, as time, staffing and funding permit.

There are some recommendations that should be implemented immediately, others that could be undertaken in the mid-term (within the next 3 years), and others that could be considered long-term (undertaken within the next five years).

The immediate recommendations are those essential for other activities to be truly effective. In most cases they involve internal City operations -- such as City policy, City regulations, and departmental organization so that staff activities are most effective. In fact, a few of these priorities involve only refinements to work already being undertaken by City departments.

Outlined below are the recommendations contained in the narrative of the report (Chapter V) in a proposed priority order. Of course, if funding becomes available or other organizations wish to assist in some of the other activities, they might be undertaken sooner than outlined here.

### IMMEDIATE PRIORITIES

#### City Policy

***Develops clear, well articulated policy regaling preservation and an organization structure to implement this policy.***

1. Develop and adopt a strong Preservation Policy to provide direction to City Departments when dealing with issues that have an impact on preservation.
2. Develop a process for protecting and maintaining historical properties owned or controlled by the City.
3. Organize departmentally for effectiveness and efficiency in dealing with preservation issues so that planning, regulations, economic development, urban design, housing, and neighborhood activities are housed within a single city department.

***Develop a priority for the Historic Resource Commission to designate buildings and areas, especially those at risk.***

1. Develop a priority designation list and work vigorously to designate properties.
2. Monitor the status of listed buildings and areas for any threats to their continued preservation.

***Develop a more effective system for presenting and advocating commission recommendations to City Council, the Development Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals.***

1. Develop a reporting form to formalize presentation of commission recommendations to the various review bodies.
2. Facilitate contact between the commissions and the political bodies so that each is aware of the roles and responsibilities of the other.
3. Encourage commission members to present the commission's recommendations at meetings where issues are being decided. At the very least ensure that the commission's written recommendation and the reasons for the recommendation are presented at the meeting.

## Regulations

### ***Make a greater effort to use more aggressive enforcement to solve problems.***

1. Support architectural review commissions by issuing "stop work" orders for work undertaken without commission approval and enforce the "Failure to Maintain" ordinance where willful demolition by neglect is taking place.

### ***Focus nuisance abatement efforts in designated districts and older neighborhoods on building stabilization and conservation rather than on demolition.***

1. Review and implement recommendations from the Nuisance Abatement Task Force review of this issue in 1990.
2. Consider appropriating and rehabilitating properties for resale using provisions allowed by the Ohio Revised Code (Section 719.012).
3. At the very least, board up and stabilize sound buildings while working with neighborhood organizations and area commissions to locate responsible new owners.

### ***Amend the city's zoning code to recognize central city development patterns and to enhance rather than conflict with neighborhood character and revitalization efforts.***

1. Develop and implement neighborhood-sensitive zoning standards for use in the central city neighborhoods that take into account issues that define neighborhood character, such as setback, building height, lot coverage, use, density and parking.

### ***Make improvements to the design review process.***

1. Expedite issuance of "Certificates of Appropriateness" so that it takes no longer than one week from approval by the commission to issuance of the certificate.
2. Improve staffing for commissions by hiring a preservation architect, a position that has been approved by City Council.
3. Provide training for commission members so that they are knowledgeable about the design review process, appropriate rehabilitation techniques, and dealing effectively with the public.

### ***Tailor code enforcement for historic districts and designated properties to facilitate preservation.***

1. Develop appropriate paperwork for code enforcement activities for historic districts and designated properties so that written orders do not conflict with the goals of preservation. Specifically rewrite orders to state "repair and maintain after consultation with appropriate regulatory commission" rather than "repair or demolish" the property.

## Neighborhoods

### ***Continue to promote neighborhood-based planning so that plans reflect the desires and concerns of neighborhood residents and property owners.***

1. Continue the development of neighborhood plans, with the city staff working closely with neighborhood residents and property owners. Neighborhood history should be an important part of these plans and recommended activities should recognize and enhance that history.

### ***Systematically enforce building and zoning codes, with an eye to catching problems before they become nuisances.***

1. Implement systematic code enforcement on an area-wide basis to identify problem properties before they become nuisances.
2. Work with neighborhood organizations and area commissions to develop a neighborhood "Spotter" program to help identify and monitor problem properties.

***Photographically document changes that have occurred in neighborhoods and develop a process to monitor change over time.***

1. Work with neighborhood organizations and area commissions to make a photographic record of each neighborhood and to record changes as they occur.

#### **Downtown**

***Undertake new and continue existing activities oriented toward influencing the character and quality of downtown development.***

1. Adopt Goals for a Better Built Environment as the City's downtown development guidelines and review all proposed projects for adherence to the guidelines.

#### **Education and Public Awareness**

***Provide training for OF staff in all aspects of preservation.***

1. Develop a training program on preservation topics so that city staff are aware of preservation issues and better able to incorporate preservation values to their daily work.

## **MID TERM PRIORITIES (UNDERTAKEN WITHIN NEXT THREE YEARS)**

### **City Policy**

*Enhance the City's ability to respond quickly and effectively to preservation emergencies.*

1. Establish a "Preservation SWAT Team" to respond when significant historic structures are threatened with damage or demolition.

*Amend existing preservation legislation to make the Historic Resources Commission more effective.*

1. Review the existing ordinance and develop amendments that address the weaknesses in the current legislation.

### **Regulations**

*Tailor code enforcement exalts in older neighborhoods to facilitate preservation of sound buildings.*

1. Establish a Preservation code enforcement specialist" with specific training in older building technology and preservation/rehabilitation techniques.

*Ensure that zoning enhances rather than conflicts with neighborhood character and revitalization efforts.*

1. Consider neighborhood or area rezonings where it is appropriate as a means of encouraging desired investment and where it is based on area planning.

### **Neighborhoods**

*Undertake "conservation zoning" for neighborhoods, areas, and districts wishing to have some level of design review.*

1. Develop a model of conservation zoning that can be implemented in areas where some level of design review is desirable but where full historic district commission review is not appropriate.
2. Develop an "Infill Prototype" demonstration project which shows that appropriately designed infill housing can be cost-effective.

### **Downtown**

*Encourage the retention and reuse of existing buildings downtown.*

1. Identify key buildings and areas and designate them on the Columbus Register of Historic Properties.
2. Continue to develop area plans for downtown. Preservation planning should be incorporated into these plans where older buildings exist.
3. Create a visual record of downtown by photographing downtown buildings and photographing changes as they occur.



## **Tools and Incentives**

*Explore opportunities for economic incentives to encourage investment in the city's older neighborhoods and districts.*

1. Maintain and improve the infrastructure in older areas of the city as a means of encouraging private investment.
2. Explore the use of tax incentives (such as short-term tax abatement or city income tax credits) to encourage private investment in older properties.

*Make use of existing tools to further preservation activities.*

1. Use the power of eminent domain to prevent the loss of key buildings and areas.

## **Education and Public Awareness**

*Develop well Searched materials that document the benefit of preservation activities in Columbus.*

1. Develop promotional materials that clearly state the benefit of preservation activities in Columbus, including the dollars invested, the value and impact of heritage tourism, and how the tax base has been stabilized and increased in historically designated areas.

## **LONG-TERM PRIORITIES (UNDERTAKEN WITHIN FIVE YEARS)**

### **Neighborhoods**

*Aggressively promote Columbus neighborhoods to the entire Columbus community.*

1. Develop promotional activities, working with neighborhood organizations and area commissions, that promote the benefits of living in the city's neighborhoods. Target audiences such as the Chamber of Commerce, the media, lenders, and real estate professionals.

*Develop and maintain a "Model Houses as a training laboratory for city neighborhoods.*

1. Rehabilitate an existing older building as a showcase for cost-effective and appropriate rehabilitation methods and techniques.
2. Work with community organizations to make the model house a focus for neighborhood-related educational programs such as workshops for homeowners, contractors and builders; tours for real estate professionals and lenders; and vocational training for young people.

### **Tools and Incentives**

*Develop tools and incentives to encourage preservation activity.*

1. Establish a "Revolving Funds for acquisition of key buildings when they are threatened with demolition.
2. Package rehabilitation opportunities and seek potential developers for major rehabilitation projects.
3. Promote existing housing finance programs through neighborhood organizations.
4. Aggressively work to ensure that housing finance programs do not discourage or prohibit purchase of existing housing.

### **Education and Public Awareness**

*Provide and develop materials that encourage a greater awareness of the benefits of preservation*

1. Develop a reference library of materials about preservation, such as rehabilitation technology, architectural history, design guidelines for Columbus neighborhoods, product information, and referral lists of contractors.
2. Develop a series of materials for use by the public on preservation topics, including rehabilitation techniques and economic incentives to encourage preservation.

## VII. Designation Priorities

Columbus contains a large number of both individual properties and districts that have been identified as being eligible for listing in both the National Register of Historic Places and the Columbus Register of Historic Properties. The City has been in the process of identifying potentially eligible historic resources within the city limits for several years. Two reports -Historic District Evaluation for the City of Columbus (1989) and Historic Property Evaluation for the City of Columbus, Phase I ( 1990) - have been issued. Phase II of the Historic Property Evaluation still needs to be done, but even now the Historic Resources Commission has a very good idea of where many eligible properties are located and why they are considered significant. It should be noted that the Historic District and Property Evaluations were based on information available at the time of the project, and additional properties will likely be identified in the future as additional research is conducted on Columbus' historic resources.

The Historic Resources Commission is charged with the role of making recommendations to City Council regarding additions to the Columbus Register of Historic Properties. Since not all eligible properties can or should be designated at once, the Commission will need to establish priorities for designation. Outlined below are suggestions for how these priorities might be established.

1. **Listing in the National Register of Historic Places** - There are a number of properties that have been listed in the National Register of Historic Places (both individually and as part of large historic districts outside of local historic district boundaries) but have not yet been designated locally. A popular misconception is that the National Register alone can protect properties from demolition or adverse alterations. Only local designation can protect a property, which requires review for all proposed exterior alterations or demolition. The National Register is only effective if federal funding or other federal action is involved in an undertaking. One of the priorities for local designation should be those properties already recognized by the National Register for their significance and not currently protected through local designation. While there are only a few National Historic Landmarks in Columbus, they too should be priorities for designation. A list of National Historic Landmarks and National Register properties located within the City of Columbus is included in the Appendix.
2. **Properties at Risk** - In this case the definition of "at risk" has a fairly broad meaning. Properties that might fit into this category are the obvious -- those where demolition is a known or potential threat -- as well as some less obvious situations such as properties that have been on the market for a long period of time, especially if they are vacant and not being maintained; properties that are deteriorating but the owner seems unwilling to sell; and properties located in areas where there are pressures for more intensive development. For example, the Eddie Rickenbacker House, located at 1334 East Livingston Avenue, is a National Historic Landmark, but it has been on the market for several years and its fate is uncertain.
3. **Scarcity of Resource.** Some property types already are or are in danger of becoming rare in the city, and Columbus Register designation may be the only way to protect them from extinction. This is especially true in the downtown area, where there has been extensive demolition over the last 10 to 20 years. Many Me historic banks, hotels, office buildings, apartment buildings, and stores have already been demolished, and the survivors are fewer in number every year. Other scarce types of resources include those associated with Columbus' railroads, its industrial history, and its very prominent place in state history as a location for state institutions.
4. **Properties Identified as Priorities in Neighborhood or Area Plans.** As the City of Columbus continues to work with neighborhood and downtown organizations on the development of area plans, the preservation of individual properties or historic districts will likely be identified as goals in some of these plans. In such cases, the Historic Resources Commission should work closely with the interested parties to coordinate designations and reviews for alterations or demolition in these areas.
5. **Property Owner Interest.** A property owner's interest in designation and protection of his property should be encouraged. Since Columbus City Council is responsible for final decisions on designations, positive owner involvement is more likely to result in a successful nomination to the Columbus Register.

Some properties might fall into several of these categories and therefore would be very high priorities for designation and protection.

## **VIII. APPENDIX**

Sample Questionnaire

List of Those Interviewed

Architectural Review Commissions in Columbus

Area Commissions in Columbus

## COMPREHENSIVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION IMPLEMENTATION STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

The City's historic preservation office is charged with the development of a historic preservation plan for the City. As part of this ongoing process, Benjamin D. Rickey & Co. has been hired to develop a comprehensive historic preservation implementation strategy. The study is being funded, in part, by a grant from the Ohio Historic Preservation Office. Public input is a critical element in the development of a presentation strategy for Columbus. Input is being solicited through this questionnaire, through extensive interviews with public officials and community leaders and through two public workshops. Please help us by taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Please fold, stamp and mail the finished questionnaire.

**Please tell us something about yourself. You may check more than one answer. Are you a member**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of a City Commission
- \_\_\_\_\_ an applicant before a design review Commission
- \_\_\_\_\_ a property owner (zip code)
- \_\_\_\_\_ a business owner
- \_\_\_\_\_ an architect
- \_\_\_\_\_ a contractor
- \_\_\_\_\_ a developer
- \_\_\_\_\_ a realtor
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (please explain)

**What is your background or interest in the area of historic preservation?**

**Do you live or work in a historic preservation district? yes no If yes, which one?**

**Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5 (1-strongly disagree, 2-somewhat disagree, 3-somewhat agree, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree)**

1. I have a high regard for historic preservation activities in Columbus. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Historic preservation has been successful in Columbus. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Columbus citizens care about the quality of architecture and urban design. 1 2 3 4 5
4. The elected leadership in Columbus is strongly supportive of preservation. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The business leadership in Columbus is strongly supportive of preservation. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Historic preservation activities should be strongly encouraged in downtown. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Preservation imposes an unreasonable economic burden on property owners. 1 2 3 4 5
8. What role should historic preservation play in Columbus neighborhoods?
9. What role should historic preservation play in downtown Columbus?
10. Please list in descending order of importance what you consider to be the most important concerns/issues in the area of historic preservation in Columbus.  
(A.)  
(B.)  
(C.)  
(D.)  
(E.)
11. Please list in descending order of importance what you consider to be the impediments or barriers to historic preservation in Columbus.  
(A.)  
(B.)  
(C.)  
(D.)  
(E.)

Other comments:

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP.

Benjamin D. Rickey & Co. 391 Library Park South Columbus, Ohio 43215

## Critical Issues

♦ Educating city officials/employees/developers/leadership	(11)
♦ Lack of government support: staff, planning, financial incentives, legislation	(11)
♦ Maintaining landmarks like Central, Columbus Museum etc	(10)
♦ Saving existing housing	(10)
♦ Stopping Demolitions	(8)
♦ Establishing a preservation ethic - being fully incorporated into planning	(8)
♦ Public's lack of knowledge/education on benefits of HP	(7)
♦ Saving existing housing stock from demolition	(7)
♦ Enforcing existing Codes	(7)
♦ Money/costs	(7)
♦ Identifying properties/areas of historical significance	(4)
♦ Potential for impact on low income areas	(4)
♦ Landmarking more districts	(3)
♦ Sympathetic zoning	(3)
♦ Perception that HP is obstructionism	(2)
♦ Simplifying certificate of appropriateness process	(2)
♦ Need to stress economic/energy saving soundness of HP	(2)
♦ Reduce Council's and Developers roles	(2)
♦ Need for sympathetic infill	(2)
♦ School district	
♦ Ethnic identity	
♦ Ability to focus on items of high impact/not picky	
♦ New tools	
♦ Neighborhood leadership	
♦ Lack of on-going publicity regarding successful projects	
♦ Attracting middle class back	
♦ Savvy use of current rules & regs	
♦ Inability of preservationist to prioritize issues/structures	
♦ misconception of meaning of HP - appears an elitists view	

## Question #11 : Major Impediments/Barriers

♦ Attitudes of City/Leaders [pro-development]	(16)
♦ General lack of a preservation ethic/Citizen apathy or lack of knowledge	(13)
♦ Costs associated with updating	(11)
♦ Lack of a well-articulated preservation policy	(11)
♦ Inability of city to enforce nuisance laws and zoning/ignorance of staff	(9)
♦ Lack of a coordinated group or body/lack of leadership and consensus	(8)
♦ Developers	(8)
♦ Lack of financial incentives	(8)
♦ DCI	(6)
♦ Codes & regs too complicated/red tape	(5)
♦ Local commission abuse/misuse of guidelines	(5)
♦ Business community's misperceptions	(4)
♦ Arrogant BZA	(3)
♦ Building code problems with older buildings	
♦ Difficulty in getting areas designated	
♦ Lack of government support	
♦ Unequal funding to different areas	
♦ Socio-economic characteristics of some areas	
♦ Perception that Columbus doesn't have anything to save	
♦ No power in individual neighborhoods	
♦ Biased media	
♦ Lack of laws to protect housing stock	

## Survey Responses, Questions 8-9

### What role should historic preservation play In Columbus' neighborhoods?

- ♦ Organize a committee to evaluate what is significant and recommend/establish guidelines for significant areas; preservation should be focal point of neighborhood revitalization strategies and delivery of services must be supported by policies and coordinated with preservation activities and interdepartmentally (4)
- ♦ Establish neighborhood commissions with design review and demolition authority to protect neighborhood from inappropriate development; must go beyond just listing in the Columbus Register; concentrated areas are better than "spotty" efforts (4)
- ♦ Preserve the built environment for public purpose without economic burden and offer economic incentives (2)
- ♦ Exercise reasonable limitations; maintain character but allow modernization; specific structures should be saved, but needs of owners should be considered; some commissions go too far; once an area is designated, rules should be equitably applied ( 6 )
- ♦ A very strong one; preservation gives areas character and links with the past; can
- ♦ generate pride and encourage the best in architecture and design; some areas have little else to build on other than their latent historical resources (12)
- ♦ Successful areas should provide active support for budding neighborhoods with City Council
- ♦ Integrate preservation into all remodeling/renovation in all old residential and commercial areas but not all should be monitored by a commission
- ♦ The role of preservation shouldn't be questioned; it offers an economically sound way of achieving quality and aesthetics; there is a need to educate residents and users and encourage their participation (4)
- ♦ Commission process works but zoning and other City departments need to better understand this critical work (2)
- ♦ Whatever the particular neighborhood deems it should play; it should enhance the areas, but not force people out economically (3)
- ♦ To stabilize and improve; provide direction and support for redevelopment - should be grant and award programs, training for property owners; a key role - city needs to adopt incentives like easements, tax credits etc (3)



### **What role should historic preservation play in downtown Columbus?**

- ♦ A very strong one, this is the City's center; major commitment should be made and economic incentives should be offered; downtown should be a showcase for our physical history and a part of the comprehensive plan; a good mix of old and new is essential - we're getting to a point of no return (23)
- ♦ There should be reasonable limitations; specific buildings should be saved, but the use of these buildings should not be too closely controlled (8)
- ♦ Provide variances to make rehab possible
- ♦ Should be immersed in the development process and addressed early in planning efforts; no more demolition - preserve few remaining streetscapes by whatever means necessary (3)
- ♦ Corporations should provide leadership (2)
- ♦ Build on existing inventories of significant structures and help developers who are sympathetic; develop a preservation strategy (area and site specific) and keep a "most endangered" list; support adaptive re-use and infill projects (7)
- ♦ Educate city leaders in the social, political and architectural value of significant structures (3)
- ♦ Provide a forceful alternative to DCI to assure that preservation-related issues receive a fair hearing
- ♦ The state is one of the worst offenders

## **LIST OF THOSE INTERVIEWED**

### **City Council Members**

Cynthia Cecil Lazarus  
Michael Coleman  
John Kennedy  
M.D. Portman  
Arlene Shoemaker  
Les Wright

### **Architectural Review Commission Members**

Rob Vogt, Italian Village Commission  
Roger Farrell, Italian Village Commission  
Charlie Coleman, Victorian Village Commission  
David Diroll, Victorian Village Commission  
Kay Benton, North Market Commission, former member of Historic Resources Commission  
Daniel Thomas, Acting Historic Preservation Officer, City of Columbus (Interview conducted by Judy Williams, Scot Dewhirst, German Village Commission Members)

### **Area Commission Members**

Carol Stewart, Franklinton Area Commission  
Alina Butler, Hilltop Area Commission  
Doreen Uhas-Sauer, University Area Commission  
Judy Hoza, University Area Commission  
Dan Robinson, University Area Commission  
Candy Watkins, Near East Area Commission  
Bertha Jefferson, Near East Area Commission  
Walt Reiner, North Linden Area Commission  
Becky Ellis, North Linden Area Commission  
Bob Schuler, Northeast Area Commission

### **City Staff**

#### Planning Division

Daniel Thomas, Planning Supervisor (Urban Design), Acting Historic Preservation Officer  
Ken Klare, Urban Designer  
Beth Clark, Planning Supervisor (Comprehensive Plan)  
Kevin Wheeler, Comprehensive Planner  
Julie Gafford, Area Planner  
Amanda Maxwell, Code Development

#### Economic Development Division

Deborah Younger, Program Manager  
Betsy Meleski, Economic Development  
Gregory Hrehon, Economic Development

### **Regulations Division**

Mike Farrenkopf, Acting Sr. Code Enforcement Officer  
Jesse Scott, Sr., Senior Housing/Zoning Inspector  
Fred Stewart-Magee, Plans Examiner  
Dave Perry, Development Planner  
Roy Briegal, Land Use Manager  
Michael, Betuel, Housing Inspector  
Laura Scott, Senior Housing/Zoning inspector  
Brad Jones, Zoning/Graphics

**Human Services Department**

Lou Meek, Manager, Housing Rehabilitation  
Malcolm Mahan, Administrative Coordinator, Housing Rehabilitation  
Tom Lewis, Housing Rehab Technician  
Maria Meek, Housing Rehab Technician  
Tim Cullenen, Housing Rehab Technician  
Gene Hurd, Housing Rehab Technician  
Dan Kaiser, Housing Rehab Technician  
Stacey Hall, Housing Rehab Technician

**Downtown Columbus Inc.**

Ed Armentrout, President  
William Lhota, Board Member  
Dorothy Teater, Board Member, Franklin Co. Commissioner  
Michael Stinziano, Board Member, State Representative

**Columbus Landmarks Foundation**

Georgia Ehlers, Director  
Henry Hunker, Past President  
Kathy Mast Kane, Board Member  
Doreen Uhas Sauer, Board Member  
Connie Swain, Board Member  
Beth Fisher, Advocacy Committee Member

**Citizens for a Better Skyline**

Chris Steele, President  
Pasquale Grado, Board Member

**Business Leaders**

Walter Cates, Main Street Business Association  
Jonathan York, Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce

**Developers, Contractors**

Sandy Wood, Wood Development Company  
Jeff Edwards, Multicon Development Company  
Todd Henning, Baker Henning Productions  
Damon Baker, Baker Henning Productions

**Community Leaders**

Sam Gresham, Columbus Urban League  
Don Devere, Columbus Neighborhood Design Assistance Center  
Susan Fisher, Columbus Neighborhood Design Assistance Center  
Beth Hughes, Columbus Housing Partnership  
Doug Ervin, Columbus Neighborhood Housing Partnership  
John Moorehead, Columbus Neighborhood Housing Services  
Pat Schmucki, Columbus Alive  
Mark Hatch, University District Organization  
Eric Marlow, Olde Towne East Neighborhood Association  
Leon Butts, Franklin Park Neighborhood Association  
Rosemarie Caine, Woodland Park Neighborhood Association

**Public Workshop #1**

(Affiliation with an organization is known only if it was listed on the sign-in sheet)

Al Tonetti, Ohio Historic Preservation Office  
Doreen Uhas-Sauer, University Area Commission, Columbus Landmarks Foundation  
Susan Brohman

Pat Doerman, Franklinton Board of Trade  
Steve Gordon, Ohio Historic Preservation Office  
Terry Townes  
Susan King, Woodland Avenue Neighborhood Association  
Genie Morgan, Historic Resources Commission, Columbus Historical Society  
Jay Hoster, Columbus Historical Society  
Gloria Snyder  
Judith Hoza, University Area Commission  
Henry Hunker, Columbus Landmarks Foundation  
Kate Matheny, Columbus Landmarks Foundation

**Public Workshop #2**

(Affiliation with an organization is known only if it was listed on the sign-in sheet)

Daniel Thomas, City Staff, Urban Design  
Carol Stewart, Franklinton Area Commission  
George Heer, Downtown Neighborhoods Association, Downtown Columbus Inc.  
Fred Stewart-Magee, City Staff, Plans Examiner  
Susan King, Woodland Avenue Neighborhood Association  
John Rau, Ohio Historic Preservation Office  
Diane Cole, City Staff, Historic Preservation Officer  
Henry Hunker, Columbus Landmarks Foundation  
Rich Davis, Downtown Columbus. Inc.  
Jesse Scott, City Staff, Housing/Zoning Inspector

**Presentation of Recommendations to Downtown Neighborhoods Association**

Charles Pace, Victorian Village Commission  
George Heer, Downtown Neighborhoods Association  
Babs Carfrey, Hilltop Area Commission  
Carl Wiley, Mt. Vernon Avenue Area Business Association  
Barbara Simpson, North Central Area Association  
Andy Klein, Short North Business Association  
Fred Holdridge, German Village Society  
Chuck Loving, Town-Franklin Neighborhood Association  
Kathy Fox, Capital Square Renovation Foundation  
Diane Cole, City Staff, Historic Preservation Officer  
Herbert Truax, Schumaker Place Neighborhood Association

**Presentation of Recommendations to City Planning Division Staff**

Steve McClary  
Beth Clark  
Diane Cole  
Daniel Thomas  
Julie Gafford  
Melanie Circle  
Ken Klare  
Kevin Wheeler

## **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSIONS IN THE CIVIL OF COLUMBUS**

### HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Chapter 3117 of the City of Columbus Zoning Code, established in 1980.

The Historic Resources Commission (HRC) consists of 14 members who are appointed by the Mayor. The HRC maintains the Columbus Register of Historic Properties (see attached list of buildings and districts) and reviews applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior architectural changes to properties listed on this register. Staffing assistance is provided to the HRC by the City's Historic Preservation Officer in the Department of Development.

### NORTH MARKET COMMISSION

Chapter 3329 of the City of Columbus Zoning Code, established in 1987.

The North Market Commission is a 14-member architectural review commission with responsibility for issuing Certificates of Appropriateness in the North Market Historic District. Five members of the Historic Resources Commission serve on the North Market Commission. The district is bounded generally by Swan Street on the north, High Street on the east, Red Bird Alley on the south, and N. Park Street and School Alley on the west. Staffing is provided by the Columbus Department of Development.

### GERMAN VILLAGE COMMISSION

Chapter 3325 of the City of Columbus Zoning Code, established in 1963.

The German Village Commission is a seven-member architectural review commission which has responsibility for reviewing exterior architectural changes and zoning variance requests within the 232.5-acre German Village Historic District on the south side of Columbus. German Village is generally bounded by E. Livingston Avenue on the north; Lathrop St., Brust St., Grant Ave., Jaeger St. and Blackberry Alley on the east; Nursery Lane on the south, and Pearl Street on the west. The Commission now receives staffing assistance from the Columbus Department of Development and also from a Commission Assistant provided by the German Village Society.\* It was established in 1963, as the first historic district commission in the City of Columbus.

### ITALIAN VILLAGE COMMISSION

Chapter 3327 of the City of Columbus Zoning Code, established in 1974.

The Italian Village Commission is a nine-member commission which reviews exterior architectural modifications to buildings and zoning variance requests in the Italian Village Historic District, generally bounded by Fifth Avenue on the north, Penn Central Railroad on the east, the 1-670 Innerbelt on the south, and North High Street on the west. The Commission receives staffing assistance from the Columbus Department of Development. \*

### VICTORIAN VILLAGE COMMISSION

Chapter 3331 of the City of Columbus Zoning Code, established in 1973..

The Victorian Village Commission is a nine-member architectural review commission with responsibility for reviewing exterior architectural changes and variance requests within the Victorian Village Historic District on the near north side. Victorian Village is generally bounded by Fifth Avenue on the north, High Street on the east, Goodale Street on the south, and Neil and Harrison Avenues on the west. The Commission receives staffing assistance from the Columbus Department of Development. \*

### BOARD OF COMMISSION APPEALS

Chapter 3118 of the City of Columbus Zoning Code, established in 1989.

The Board of Commission Appeals was created to provide a nonjudicial process of appeal for decisions of the City's various architectural review commissions. Made up of five members appointed by the Mayor, the Board considers appeals from any commission's denial of a certificate of appropriateness based on a claim of

substantial economic hardship or unusual or compelling circumstances in accordance with the procedures set out in Chapters 3116 and 3118 of the city code. Staff assistance is provided to the Board of Commission Appeals by the Columbus Department of Development.

\* During the course of this project, the responsibility for staffing some of the commissions was transferred from the Human Services Department to the Development Department.

## **AREA COMMISSIONS IN THE CITY OF COLUMBUS**

Area Commissions are advisory bodies established by Chapter 3315 of the Columbus Zoning Code. These commission meet regularly for the purpose of local planning for local needs within their particular area. Among their duties are creating plans and policies regarding development in their Area and making recommendations to City Council on rezonings, special permits, demolition permits, or variances affecting property within the Area.

1. Clintonville Area Commission
2. Driving Park Area Commission
3. Franklinton Area Commission
4. Greater Hilltop Area Commissions
5. Near East Area Commission
6. Northeast Area Commission
7. North Linden Area Commission
8. South Linden Area Commission
9. University Area Commission
10. Westland Area Commission
  
11. German Village Commission (also architectural review)
12. Italian Village Commission (also architectural review)
13. North Market Commission (also architectural review)
14. Victorian Village Commission (also architectural review)